

REMARKS

The final Office Action rejects claims 3-8, 14, 15, 17-20, 24-28, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by BROWN et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,363); rejects claims 2, 16, and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over BROWN et al. in view of TEEGAN et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,555); and rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over BROWN et al. in view of ESCOLAR (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,100). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 3-8, 14, 15, 17-20, 24-28, and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by BROWN et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a single reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. Applicants respectfully submit that BROWN et al. does not disclose the combination of features recited in claims 3-8, 14, 15, 17-20, 24-28, and 34-36.

For example, independent claim 34 is directed to a network-based automated message handling system for initiating responses to messages transmitted through a network by application components. The system includes at least one customer-defined message handling rule, at least one service-based message handling rule, at least one common message handling rule, and a message handler. The message handler is configured to receive a message from an application component, determine, based on a content of the received message, whether to apply the at least one customer-defined message handling rule, determine, based on the content of the received message, whether to apply the at least one service-based message handling rule,

determine, based on the content of the received message, whether to apply the at least one common message handling rule, identify at least one first party when the at least one customer-defined message handling rule applies to the received message, identify at least one second party when the at least one service-based message handling rule applies to the received message, identify at least one third party when the at least one common message handling rule applies to the received message, and generate new messages to the identified at least one first party, the identified at least one second party, and the identified at least one third party. BROWN et al. does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, BROWN et al. does not disclose or suggest at least one customer-defined message handling rule, at least one service-based message handling rule, and at least one common message handling rule. The final Office Action relies on col. 3, lines 43-60, of BROWN et al. for allegedly disclosing at least one service-based message handling rule and on col. 5, lines 20-25, and col. 5, line 65, to col. 6, line 5, of BROWN et al. for allegedly disclosing at least one common message handling rule (final Office Action, pp. 2 and 7). Applicants submit that these sections of BROWN et al. do not disclose or suggest at least one service-based message handling rule and at least one common message handling rule, as required by claim 34.

At col. 3, lines 43-60, BROWN et al. discloses:

A second kind of application that can generate events is referred to herein generally as "batch jobs." These jobs are applications that, generally, periodically check persistent data, such as data stored in a database, and look for changes that may have occurred. For example, if an application which enters new products into a database is not one which has previously been coded as a business object, to generate explicit events on this occurrence, a batch job 34 can periodically scan a product database and determine when new products have been added. Events which are discovered by such a comparison between a previous state of an object, in a persistent memory, with the current state are referred to herein as "implicit events."

Use of batch jobs to scan data looking for implicit events is useful both for events which occur over time, and for use with applications which are not already coded to generate the desired explicit events.

This section of BROWN et al. discloses the use of batch jobs to scan data looking for implicit events, which are defined as events that are discovered by a comparison between a previous state of an object and a current state of the object. Neither this section of BROWN et al. nor any other section of BROWN et al. discloses or suggests at least one service-based message handling rule, as required by claim 34. Instead, BROWN et al. merely discloses that alert manager 24 uses a set of rules to determine to whom, and when, a notification is to be made to a user. BROWN et al. does not disclose or suggest the three separate types of rules - at least one customer-defined message handling rule, at least one service-based message handling rule, and at least one common message handling rule - required by claim 34.

At col. 5, lines 20-25, BROWN et al. discloses:

Rules portions 60 contains a large number of rules defining when events are to be acted upon. Each user who desires to receive alert notifications from alert manager 24 will register with the alert manager, and define the conditions under which that user wishes to receive a notification. Rules are generally conditional statements which define where the notification is to be generated.

This section of BROWN et al. discloses that a user may define conditions under which that user wishes to receive a notification. This section of BROWN et al. in no way discloses or suggests at least one common message handling rule, as required by claim 34. The rules disclosed in this section of BROWN are user-defined.

At col. 5, line 63, to col. 6, line 9, BROWN et al. discloses:

This frees the user from having to check for events or changed conditions individually; this is done automatically by the rules set up in the alert manager.

Users can determine how these messages are to be sent. E-mail would be one typical type of message; users may also provide for one or more notification windows to be generated upon their desktop for the sole purpose of receiving alert notifications.

By setting up and registering different types of alerts with a central system, a user can be notified regarding a wide variety of events which would otherwise take too much time and effort to profitably be viewed. Upon receiving one of these alerts, the user can, if she so desires, take a corresponding action.

This section of BROWN et al. discloses that users may set up and register different types of alerts so as to be notified of a wide variety of events. This section of BROWN et al. discloses that a user may define conditions under which that user wishes to receive a notification. This section of BROWN et al. in no way discloses or suggests at least one common message handling rule, as required by claim 34. The rules disclosed in this section of BROWN are user-defined.

Since BROWN et al. does not disclose or suggest at least one customer-defined message handling rule, at least one service-based message handling rule, and at least one common message handling rule, BROWN et al. cannot disclose or suggest a message handler configured to determine, based on a content of a received message, whether to apply the at least one customer-defined message handling rule, determine, based on the content of the received message, whether to apply the at least one service-based message handling rule, determine, based on the content of the received message, whether to apply the at least one common message handling rule, identify at least one first party when the at least one customer-defined message handling rule applies to the received message, identify at least one second party when the at least one service-based message handling rule applies to the received message, identify at least one third party when the at least one common message handling rule applies to the received message, and generate new messages to the identified at least one first party, the identified at least one

second party, and the identified at least one third party, as also required by claim 34. Instead, BROWN et al. merely discloses an event router 16 that receives incoming events and routes them to recipients that have registered to receive events of this type (col. 2, lines 61-64).

BROWN et al. does not disclose or suggest that event router 16 determines, based on a content of a received message, whether at least one customer-defined message handling rule, at least one service-based message handling rule, and at least one common message handling rule apply to the message, and identifies at least one first party when the at least one customer-defined message handling rule applies to the received message, identifies at least one second party when the at least one service-based message handling rule applies to the received message, and identifies at least one third party when the at least one common message handling rule applies to the received message, as required by claim 34.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that BROWN et al. does not anticipate claim 34.

Claims 3-8 depend from claim 34. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by BROWN et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 34.

Independent claims 35 and 36 recite features similar to features described above with respect to claim 34. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by BROWN et al. for reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 34.

Claims 14, 15, and 17-20 depend from claim 35. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by BROWN et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 35.

Claims 24-28 depend from claim 36. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by BROWN et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 36.

Claims 2, 16, and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over BROWN et al. in view of TEEGAN et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 depends from claim 34. The disclosure of TEEGAN et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BROWN et al. set forth above with respect to claim 34. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over BROWN et al. and TEEGAN et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 34.

Claim 16 depends from claim 35. The disclosure of TEEGAN et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BROWN et al. set forth above with respect to claim 35. Therefore, claim 16 is patentable over BROWN et al. and TEEGAN et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 35.

Claims 29-31 depend from claim 36. The disclosure of TEEGAN et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BROWN et al. set forth above with respect to claim 36. Therefore, claims 29-31 are patentable over BROWN et al. and TEEGAN et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 36.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over BROWN et al. in view of ESCOLAR. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.


Claim 9 depends from claim 34. The disclosure of ESCOLAR does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BROWN et al. set forth above with respect to claim 34. Therefore, claim 9 is patentable over BROWN et al. and ESCOLAR, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 34.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 13-2491 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: 
John E. Harrity
Registration No. 43,367

Date: June 20, 2005

11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800